



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
DIW 08-04

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP
100 EAST WISCONSIN AVENUE, SUITE 1100
MILWAUKEE WI 53202

COPY MAILED

AUG 30 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Mitsuyuki Uchikoshi :
Application No. 10/611,713 : ON PETITION
Filed: 1 July, 2003 :
Att'y Docket No. 1779-00016 :

This is a decision on the petition under 1.137(b),¹ filed on 10 August, 2004, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned on 10 June, 2004, for failure to timely submit the issue and publication fees as required by the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due mailed on 9 March, 2004, which set a three (3) month statutory period for reply. Notice of Abandonment was mailed on 26 July, 2004.

¹Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

The statement contained in the instant petition does not set forth that the entire delay from the due date of the required reply to the date of the filing of a grantable petition was unintentional as required by 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3). However, the statement contained in the instant petition is being so construed. Petitioner **must** notify the Office if this is not a correct interpretation.

The application file is being forwarded to Publishing Division for processing into a patent.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (703) 308-6918.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions